

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tseng (6,332,646).

In addition, Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Housel (2,649,140).

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 2 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tseng (6,332,646) in view of Wallace (6,102,479).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claims 4 and 5 deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 4 and 5 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the amended claims 2, 3 and 6-8 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley
Charles E. Baxley
Attorney for Applicant
90 John Street, Third Floor
New York, N.Y. 10038-3243
Telephone 212-791-7200
Facsimile 212-791-7276